arXiv:1207.6874v1 [math.PR] 30 Jul 2012

HEAVY TAILED BRANCHING PROCESS WITH IMMIGRATION

BOJAN BASRAK, RAFAŁ KULIK, AND ZBIGNIEW PALMOWSKI

Abstract. In this paper we analyze a branching process with immigration defined recursively by $X_t = \theta_t \circ X_{t-1} + B_t$ for a sequence (B_t) of i.i.d. random variables and random mappings $\theta_t \circ x := \theta_t(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{x} A_i^{(t)}$, with $(A_i^{(t)})_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ being a sequence of $\mathbb{N}_0$-valued i.i.d. random variables independent of B_t. We assume that one of generic variables A and B has a regularly varying tail distribution. We identify the tail behaviour of the distribution of the stationary solution X_t. We also prove CLT for the partial sums that could be further generalized to FCLT. Finally, we also show that partial maxima have a Fréchet limiting distribution.

Keywords: Branching process with immigration ⋆ regularly varying distribution ⋆ INAR

Short title: Heavy tailed branching process

Contents

1. Introduction 2

2. Tail behaviour 4

2.1. Regularly varying immigration (Model I) 4

2.2. Proof of Theorem 2.2 6

2.3. Regularly varying offspring (Model II) 13

3. Asymptotics for sums and maxima 15

3.1. Point process and maxima 18

3.2. Partial sums 19

References 20

Date: July 31, 2012.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G51, 60G50, 60K25.
Research of the first author was partially supported by the Croatian government under the grant MZOS 037-0372790-2800. Research of the second author was partially supported by NSERC Grant. Research of the third author was partially supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Poland under the grant N201 412239.

1. Introduction

Branching processes with immigration are one of the corner stone models in applied probability and Markov chain theory on a countable state spaces. They were studied extensively in the literature, the classical references are: [44, 36, 27, 22, 6, 7, 8, 23, 31, 38]. The process considered in this paper appears also in various models in queueing theory (see [2, 3, 4, 5]), polling systems (with possible non-zero switch-over times; see [24, 25, 39]), infinite server queues (e.g. [20]) and processor sharing queues (e.g. [47]). This process can be also used as a model of packet forwarding in delay-tolerant mobile ad-hoc networks (see [20] for details). In the time series theory, the model considered here contains a class of so-called INteger AutoRegressive (INAR) processes, see [1]. Some possible applications of these processes, starting with medicine and biological sciences are discussed in [13, 17]. The INAR processes were originally introduced as a discrete counterpart of AR processes. However, their nonlinear structure represents a challenge for theoretical analysis.

We study a process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ indexed over $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. Here, X_0 is a random variable independent of an i.i.d. sequence of random mappings $(\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $\theta_t : \mathbb{N}_0 \to \mathbb{N}_0$ defined as follows: for each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for a sequence $(A_i^{(t)})_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of $\mathbb{N}_0$-valued i.i.d. random variables, we have:

$$\theta_t \circ x := \theta_t(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{x} A_i^{(t)} , \qquad x \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

That is, θ_t maps an integer x into a random integer with an interpretation that each of x individuals in the $(t-1)$th generation leaves behind a random number of children, and all these numbers are independent and have the same distribution as some generic random variable, say A. To introduce immigration in the model, we assume that another i.i.d. sequence $(B, B_t\,, t \in \mathbb{Z})$ of $\mathbb{N}_0$-valued random variables is given independently of the sequence $(\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Then $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfies:

$$X_t = \theta_t \circ X_{t-1} + B_t \qquad \text{for each } t \geq 1\ , \tag{1}$$

or in an alternative notation

$$X_t = \sum_{i=1}^{X_{t-1}} A_i^{(t)} + B_t \qquad \text{for each } t \geq 1\ .$$

Observe that the random mappings θ_t by definition satisfy

$$\theta_t \circ (x + y) = \theta_t^{(1)} \circ x + \theta_t^{(2)} \circ y\ ,$$

where $\theta_t^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$ on the right-hand side are independent with the same distribution as θ_t.

Denote by f and g the probability generating functions of A and B, respectively, i.e.

$$f(z) = E(z^A)\,, \qquad g(z) = E(z^B).$$

Following Foster and Williamson [21], the Markov chain (X_t) is ergodic with unique stationary distribution if and only if

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1-g(s)}{f(s)-s} ds < \infty.$$

In terms of moments, sufficient conditions are given in [43]. If

$$0 < \mu := E(A) < 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad E(\ln(1+B)) < \infty\,, \tag{2}$$

then the chain is ergodic with unique stationary distribution and even strongly mixing. From now on we assume that (2) holds.

The unique stationary representation of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is given by

$$X_t \stackrel{d}{=} B_t + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \theta_t^{(t-k)} \circ \cdots \circ \theta_{t-k+1}^{(t-k)}(B_{t-k}) =: B_t + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} \theta_{t-i}^{(t-k)}(B_{t-k}) =: \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\,. \tag{3}$$

Since $(\theta_i^{(t)})$ are i.i.d., it follows that $(C_{t,k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is another sequence of independent random variables.

In [43] one can find corresponding representation of the stationary distribution in terms o probability generating functions. For completeness, we show in Lemma 2.1 that the random series above converges with probability 1. From there, it is straightforward to check that such X_t satisfy (1).

We will also consider a Markov chain $(X'_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ which evolves as

$$X'_t = \max\{\theta_t \circ X'_{t-1}, B_t\} \qquad \text{for each } t \geq 1\,.$$

The unique stationary distribution of (X'_t) exists since $X'_t \leq X_t$ and it is given by:

$$X'_t \stackrel{d}{=} \sup\{B_t, \theta_t^{(t-k)} \circ \cdots \circ \theta_{t-k+1}^{(t-k)}(B_{t-k}) : k = 1, 2, \ldots\} = \sup\{C_{t,k} : k \geq 0\}\,. \tag{4}$$

Since X'_t are dominated by X_t in (3), the supremum above is a.s. finite. Direct calculation shows that (X'_t) define strictly stationary sequence.

In this paper we identify the tail behaviour of the distribution of the stationary solution X_t under assumption that the generic size of immigration B or generic size of offsprings A has regularly varying distribution. Although there is an extensive literature on behaviour of heavy tailed compound sums (see e.g. [16] and reference therein) or heavy tailed random difference equations (see [28] and references therein) those results do not seem to produce in a straightforward manner the asymptotics of stationary distribution for branching processes. Surprisingly, literature on tail asymptotics for branching processes is limited; see e.g. Corollary 2 in [16].

We also prove CLT for the heavy tailed partial sums that could be further generalized to FCLT (see e.g. [46]). Furthermore, we show that partial maxima have Fréchet limiting distribution.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we find the tail behaviour of stationary sequences $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(X'_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ under two different regimes. We use this result in establishing CLT for the process (X_t) in Section 3.

2. Tail behaviour

2.1. **Regularly varying immigration (Model I).** We will assume that A and B satisfy the following conditions:

$$0 < \mu = E(A) < 1 \,, \tag{5}$$

$$P(B > x) = x^{-\alpha} L(x) \,, \tag{6}$$

for some $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and a slowly varying function L. We consider here the case $\alpha \in (0,2)$ only. For $\alpha > 2$ proofs become much more involved, however, a technique is clearly suggested by the case $\alpha \in [1,2)$, see Remark 2 below. For $\alpha \in [1,2)$, we also assume that

$$E(A^2) < \infty. \tag{7}$$

In particular, it means that the tail of A is lighter than that of B in the sense that

$$P(A > x) = o(P(B > x)) \,. \tag{8}$$

The conditions above are needed, in particular, to conclude that

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{B} A_i > x\right) \sim P(B > x/\mu), \tag{9}$$

where A_i are i.i.d. copies of A, independent of B. To establish (9), in [19] the authors assume (5)-(6) and (8) together with $E(B^\alpha) < \infty$ if $\alpha = 1$; see Prop. 4.3 in [19]. On the other hand, in [42, Theorem 3.1] the authors assume that B is consistently varying (which is implied by (6)), $E(A^r) < \infty$ for some $r > 1$. Furthermore, they assume that either

$$E(B) < \infty \quad \text{together with } P(A > x) = \mathrm{o}(P(B > x)) \tag{10}$$

or

$$E(B) = \infty \quad \text{together with } xP(A > x) = \mathrm{o}(P(B > x)). \tag{11}$$

We note that the latter follows from (7) and the fact that mean of B is infinite.

In the sequel it is useful to introduce the following random variables

$$\tilde{A}^{(k)} = \theta_k \circ \cdots \circ \theta_1 \circ 1 \tag{12}$$

and assume that for each k an i.i.d. sequence $(\tilde{A}_i^{(k)})_{i\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is given with the same distribution as $\tilde{A}^{(k)}$. Note also that $\tilde{A}_i^{(1)} \stackrel{d}{=} A$. In general we have

$$\tilde{A}_i^{(k)} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{A} \tilde{A}_j^{(k-1)}$$

with all the random variables on the right hand side being independent. From the above identity and $E(A) = \mu$ we have $E(\tilde{A}_i^{(k)}) = \mu^k$. Moreover, for $C_{t,k}$ defined in (3) it holds

$$C_{t,k} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{B_{t-k}} \tilde{A}_j^{(k)}. \tag{13}$$

We start our analysis by showing that under our basic assumption (2) the random series in (3) converges a.s. and hence X_t in the same expression are properly defined.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that (2) holds. Then $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}$ converges a.s.*

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mu + \varepsilon < 1$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} P(C_{t,k} \neq 0) &= P\left(\sum_{j=1}^{B_{t-k}} \tilde{A}_j^{(k)} \neq 0\right) \\ &\leq P\left(B \geq (\mu+\varepsilon)^{-k}\right) + P\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor (\mu+\varepsilon)^{-k} \rfloor} \tilde{A}_j^{(k)} > \varepsilon\right) \\ &\leq P(\ln(1+B) \geq -k\ln(\mu+\varepsilon)) + \frac{\mu^k}{(\mu-\varepsilon)^k \varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last expression follow by the Markov inequality and $E(\tilde{A}_i^{(k)}) = \mu^k$. Since $E\ln(1+B) < \infty$, the sum of probabilities above for $k = 1$ to ∞ is finite. Hence Borel-Cantelli lemma shows that with probability 1 only finitely many $C_{t,k}$'s in (3) are different from 0. □

Condition (6) ensures that the upper tail of the immigration distribution is regularly varying. We first show that this property is inherited by the random variables X_t and X_t' introduced in (3) and (4).

Theorem 2.2. *Under the conditions (2), (5)-(7) and (10) or (11), we have*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X_t > x)}{P(B > x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X_t' > x)}{P(B > x)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu^{k\alpha} \,. \tag{14}$$

Remark 1. Our model is $X_t = \sum_{i=1}^{X_{t-1}} A_i^{(t)} + B_t$. If we assume that random variables $A_i^{(t)}$ are equal to $\mu \in (0,1)$, then we obtain $X_t = \mu X_{t-1} + B_t$, that is the AR(1) model. For such models it is well-known that

$$P(X_t > x) \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu^{k\alpha} P(B > x).$$

Hence, the tail of the branching model with random offspring $A_i^{(t)}$ is the same as that of the averaged AR(1) model.

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.2.** For $r, k = 1, 2, \ldots$ denote

$$m_r(k) := E(\tilde{A}_1^{(k)})^r = E\left(\sum_{i=1}^{A} \tilde{A}_i^{(k-1)}\right)^r,$$

with a convention $\tilde{A}_i^{(0)} = A_i$, where A_i are i.i.d. with the same distribution as A. The following lemma turns out to be very useful in the sequel

Lemma 2.3. *For $k \geq 2$ we have:*

$$E\left(\tilde{A}_1^{(k)}\right)^2 \leq E(A^2)(k+1)\mu^k. \tag{15}$$

Moreover, if $E(B^2) < \infty$, then

$$E\left(\sum_{j=1}^{B} \tilde{A}_j^{(k)}\right)^2 \leq E(B)E(A^2)(k+1)\mu^k + E(B^2)\mu^{2k}.$$

Proof. The proof of (15) is by induction on k. For $k = 2$ we bound

$$E\left(\sum_{j=1}^{A} A_j\right)^2,$$

where all random variables A, A_j are i.i.d. Simple conditioning argument yields the bound

$$E(A)E(A^2) + (E(A))^2 E(A^2) = E(A^2)\mu(1+\mu) \leq 2E(A^2)\mu$$

that matches (15) for $k = 2$.

For $k \geq 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_2(k) &= \sum_n E\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{A}_j^{(k-1)}\right)^2 P(A=n) = \\ &= \sum_n P(A=n) \sum_{j=1}^{n} E\left(\tilde{A}_j^{(k-1)}\right)^2 \\ &+ \sum_n P(A=n) \sum_{\substack{j,l \\ j\neq l}} E\left(\tilde{A}_j^{(k-1)}\right) E\left(\tilde{A}_l^{(k-1)}\right) \\ &\leq E(A)E(A^2)k\mu^{k-1} + E(A^2)\mu^{2k} \leq E(A^2)(k+1)\mu^k. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\sum_{j=1}^{B} \tilde{A}_j^{(k)}\right)^2 &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} nP(B=n)E(\tilde{A}_0^{(k)})^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 P(B=n)E(\tilde{A}_0^{(k)})^2 \\ &\leq E(B)E(A^2)(k+1)\mu^k + E(B^2)\mu^{2k}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.3. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2.

Step 1: Large deviation results, such as those developed in [35], [19] (see also [42]) yield that under the conditions (5)-(7) and either (10) or (11) we have,

$$P(\theta_t(B_{t-1}) > x) \sim P(B > x/\mu) \, .$$

By induction,

$$P(C_{t,k} > x) = P\left(\bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} \theta_{t-i}^{(t-k)}(B_{t-k}) > x\right) \sim P(B > x/\mu^k) \, . \tag{16}$$

Thus, each of $C_{t,k}$, $k \geq 0$, is regularly varying and since they are independent, the random variables

$$X_{t,m} = \sum_{k=0}^{m} C_{t,k}$$

and

$$X'_{t,m} = \max\{C_{t,k} : k = 0, \ldots, m\}$$

both have the same property and satisfy

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X_{t,m} > x)}{P(B > x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X'_{t,m} > x)}{P(B > x)} = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \mu^{k\alpha} \, ; \tag{17}$$

see [41] for instance.

Step 2: To bound lim inf in (14) from below note that:

$$\liminf_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} \geq \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sum_{k=0}^{m} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} \, .$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} \geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mu^{k\alpha} \, ,$$

by applying (17) and letting $m \to \infty$.

Step 3: To establish an upper bound for the tail of X_t in (14) it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} = 0. \tag{18}$$

Similarly, to obtain an upper bound for the tail of X'_t, it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sup_{k\geq k_0} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} = 0. \tag{19}$$

However, once we show (18), (19) follows immediately.

Observe that:

$$\frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} \leq \frac{P(\sup_{k\geq k_0} B_{t-k} > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k)}{P(B > x)} + \frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k\}} > x)}{P(B > x)}. \tag{20}$$

The first term on the right hand side is bounded above by:

$$\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{P(B > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k)}{P(B > x)}.$$

One can use the Potter's bounds (see [41]) now to see that its limit is zero if we let first x and then k_0 converge to ∞. The second term is more difficult to handle, hence we split the proof in different cases with respect to the value of α.

Case $0 < \alpha < 1$: For the second term in (20) we apply the Markov inequality to bound it by

$$\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k \frac{E\left(B_{t-k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k\}}\right)}{xP(B > x)}.$$

By Karamata's theorem in combination with the Potter's bounds each summand above is bounded by

$$(1+\varepsilon)\mu^k \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{\mu^k}\right)^{1-\alpha},$$

for x, k_0 large enough. Hence, we observe that (18) holds once we take $\lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty}$ in (20).

Note that a nonnegative random variable Y is regularly varying with index α if and only if Y^j, $j > 0$ is regularly varying with index α/j. This remark turns out to be very useful in the rest of the proof.

Case $1 \leq \alpha < 2$: Note that (18) is equivalent to a requirement:

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > \sqrt{x})}{P(B > \sqrt{x})} = \lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{P((\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k})^2 > x)}{P(B^2 > x)} = 0.$$

Repeating a similar argument as for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we obtain

$$\frac{P\left(\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\right)^2 > x\right)}{P(B^2 > x)} \leq \frac{P(\sup_{k\geq k_0} B_{t-k}^2 > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k})}{P(B^2 > x)} + \frac{P\left(\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-k}^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)^2 > x\right)}{P(B^2 > x)}.$$

The first term could be treated using the Potter's bound since B^2 is regularly varying. Using Markov inequality, the second one can be bounded above by:

$$\frac{E\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)^2}{xP(B^2>x)} \le \frac{E\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C^2_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)} + \\ + \frac{E\left(\sum_{\substack{k,l=k_0\\k\neq l}}^{\infty} C_{t,k}C_{t,l}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2_{t-l}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)} =: J_1(k_0)+J_2(k_0).$$

Since by Lemma 2.3:

$$m_2(k) = E\left(\tilde{A}^{(k)}\right)^2 < C(k+1)\mu^k\,,$$

it follows that

$$E\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\tilde{A}^{(k)}_j\right)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} E\left(\tilde{A}^{(k)}_j\right)^2 + \sum_{\substack{j,l=1\\j\neq l}}^{n} E\left(\tilde{A}^{(k)}_j\right)E\left(\tilde{A}^{(k)}_l\right) < Cn(k+1)\mu^k + n^2\mu^{2k}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(k_0) &= \frac{E\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C^2_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)} \\ &\le \sum_{k=k_0}\frac{\sum_{n\le(x(1-\varepsilon))^{1/2}/\mu^k} E\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\tilde{A}^{(k)}_j\right)^2 P(B_{t-k}=n)}{xP(B^2>x)} \\ &\le \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C(k+1)\mu^k\frac{E\left(B\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)} + \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}\mu^{2k}\frac{E\left(B^2\mathbb{I}_{\{B^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)} \\ &= J_{11}(k_0)+J_{12}(k_0)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Since B^2 is regularly varying with index $\alpha/2\in(0,1)$, Karamata's theorem applies again and we finally have

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty}\limsup_{x\to\infty} J_{12}(k_0) = 0.$$

If $E(B)<\infty$, then $J_{11}(k_0)$ is bounded by

$$J_{11}(k_0) \le C\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}(k+1)\mu^k\frac{E(B)}{xP(B^2>x)}$$

and hence goes to 0 as $x\to\infty$. Otherwise, if $E(B)=\infty$ (hence $\alpha=1$), then we write

$$J_{11}(k_0) = C\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}(k+1)\mu^k\frac{E\left(B\mathbb{I}_{\{B<\sqrt{x}\sqrt{1-\varepsilon}/\mu^k\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)}. \tag{21}$$

Now, we note that

$$E(B1_{\{B\le y\}}) \le \int_0^y P(B>u)du =: \tilde{L}(y).$$

Theorem 1.5.9a in [12] yields that $\tilde{L}(y)$ is slowly varying. Furthermore, the Potter's theorem yields that for any chosen constants $A>0$ and $\delta>0$,

$$\frac{\tilde{L}(y)}{\tilde{L}(z)} \le A\max\left\{\left(\frac{y}{z}\right)^{\delta},\left(\frac{y}{z}\right)^{-\delta}\right\},$$

as long as y and z are sufficiently large. Hence, for a sufficiently large x,

$$E\left(B\mathbb{I}_{\{B<\sqrt{x}\sqrt{1-\varepsilon}/\mu^k\}}\right) \le \tilde{L}(\sqrt{x}\sqrt{1-\varepsilon}/\mu^k) \le C\tilde{L}(\sqrt{x})\max\{\mu^{k\delta},\mu^{-k\delta}\}.$$

Thus,

$$J_{11}(k_0) \le C\frac{\tilde{L}(\sqrt{x})}{xP(B^2>x)}\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}(k+1)\mu^{k(1-\delta)}.$$

The series is summable if we choose $\delta\in(0,1)$. Now, $\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{\tilde{L}(\sqrt{x})}{xP(B^2>x)}=0$, since $\tilde{L}$ is slowly varying and $P(B>\sqrt{x})$ is regularly varying with index $-1/2$.

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned} J_2(k_0) &= \frac{\sum_{\substack{k,l=k_0\\k\neq l}}^{\infty} E\left(C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-k}^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)E\left(C_{t,l}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-l}^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)} \\ &\le \frac{\sum_{\substack{k,l=k_0\\k\neq l}}^{\infty} E\left((k+1)\mu^k B_{t-k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-k}^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)E\left((l+1)\mu^l B_{t-l}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-l}^2<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{2k}\}}\right)}{xP(B^2>x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, if $E(B)<\infty$, then the term is bounded by

$$\frac{(E(B))^2}{xP(B^2>x)}\sum_{\substack{k,l=k_0\\k\neq l}}^{\infty}(k+1)(l+1)\mu^{k+l}$$

and hence

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty}\limsup_{x\to\infty} J_2(k_0)=0.$$

Otherwise, if $E(B)=\infty$, we apply the same argument as for $J_{11}(k_0)$.

Remark 2. Let us briefly discuss the case of $2\le\alpha<3$ (the same applies to all $\alpha\ge 2$). To prove Theorem 2.2 for this range of α it suffices to show that:

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty}\limsup_{x\to\infty}\frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}C_{t,k}>x^{1/3})}{P(B>x^{1/3})} = \lim_{k_0\to\infty}\limsup_{x\to\infty}\frac{P((\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty}C_{t,k})^3>x)}{P(B^3>x)}=0.$$

Note that

$$\frac{P\left(\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\right)^3 > x\right)}{P(B^3 > x)}$$
$$\leq \frac{P(\sup_{k\geq k_0} B^3_{t-k} > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3k})}{P(B^3 > x)} + \frac{P\left(\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3k}\}}\right)^3 > x\right)}{P(B^3 > x)}.$$

The first term in this bound is handled as before. For the second term apply Markov inequality and note that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3k}\}}\right)^3 \\
&\leq \Big[\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} E\left(C^3_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3k}\}}\right) \\
&+ 3\sum_{\substack{k,j=k_0\\k\neq j}}^{\infty} E\left(C^2_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3k}\}}C_{t,j}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-j}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3j}\}}\right) \\
&+ \sum_{\substack{k,j,l=k_0\\k\neq j\neq l}}^{\infty} E\left(C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-k}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3k}\}}C_{t,j}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-j}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3j}\}}C_{t,l}\mathbb{I}_{\{B^3_{t-l}<x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^{3l}\}}\right)\Big] \\
&=: L_1(k_0) + L_2(k_0) + L_3(k_0)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, $L_3(k_0)$ can be bounded above by:

$$(E(B))^3 \sum_{\substack{k,j,l=k_0\\k\neq j\neq l}}^{\infty} (k+1)(j+1)(l+1)\mu^{k+j+l} \leq (E(B))^3 \left(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \mu^k\right)^3.$$

Hence $\lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty} L_3(k_0)(xP(B^3 > x))^{-1} = 0$. To deal with $L_1(k_0)$ and $L_2(k_0)$ we proceed in the same way like in the step 3 of the proof of Theorem 2.2. We only need a bound similar to that

of Lemma 2.3. Using similar arguments like in the proof of Lemma 2.3 observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_3(k) &\le \mu E(\tilde{A}^{(k-1)})^3 + 3\mu E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-1)})^2 + E(A^3)\mu^{3k} \\
&= \mu\left\{\mu E(\tilde{A}^{(k-2)})^3 + 3\mu E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-2)})^2 + E(A^3)\mu^{3(k-1)}\right\} \\
&\quad + 3\mu E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-1)})^2 + E(A^3)\mu^{3k} \\
&= \mu^2\left\{\mu E(\tilde{A}^{(k-3)})^3 + 3\mu E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-3)})^2 + E(A^3)\mu^{3(k-2)}\right\} \\
&\quad + 3\mu^2 E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-2)})^2 + 3\mu E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-1)})^2 + E(A^3)\mu^{3(k-1)} + E(A^3)\mu^{3k} \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \mu^k E(\tilde{A}^{(0)})^3 + 3\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\mu^j E(A^2)E(\tilde{A}^{(k-j)})^2 + E(A^3)\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\mu^{3(k-j)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.3 produces:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_3(k) &\le \mu^k E(A^3) + E(A^3)k\mu^{2k} + 3E(A^2)E(A^2)\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\mu^j(k-j+1)\mu^{k-j} \\
&\le \mu^k E(A^3) + E(A^3)k\mu^{2k} + 3E(A^2)E(A^2)k^2\mu^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar computation can be done, in principle, for arbitrary $m_r(k)$, $r \ge 4$. We note in passing that classical inequalities, like Rosenthal's inequality, do not seem to be applicable here.

2.3. **Regularly varying offspring (Model II).** Throughout this subsection we will assume the following conditions:

$$0 < \mu := E(A) < 1\,, \tag{22}$$

$$P(A > x) = x^{-\alpha}L(x)\,, \tag{23}$$

for some $\alpha \in (1,2)$ and a slowly varying function L. We consider here the case $\alpha \in (1,2)$ only. For $\alpha > 2$ the proof of the main result of this subsection could be adopted along the lines of Remark 2. We will also assume that the tail of B is not heavier than that of A in the sense that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{P(B > x)}{P(A > x)} = c\,, \tag{24}$$

where c is finite (possible equal 0) constant. If $c > 0$ we need also to assume that B is consistently varying. In particular, we note that (24) together with (22) implies that $E(B) < \infty$.

From [16], using induction, we can conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\tilde{A}^{(k)} > x) &\sim \mu P(\tilde{A}^{(k-1)} > x) + P\left(A > \frac{x}{E\tilde{A}^{(k-1)}}\right) \\
&\sim \mu P(\tilde{A}^{(k-1)} > x) + \mu^{(k-1)\alpha} P(A > x) \\
&\sim \mu^2 P(\tilde{A}^{(k-2)} > x) + \mu\mu^{(k-2)\alpha} P(A > x) + \mu^{(k-1)\alpha} P(A > x) \\
&\sim \mu^{(k-1)\alpha} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mu^{j(1-\alpha)} P(A > x) =: d_k P(A > x).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using again [16], we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(C_{t,k} > x) &= P\left(\bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} \theta_{t-i}^{(t-k)}(B_{t-k}) > x\right) \sim E(B)P(\tilde{A}^{(k)} > x) + P(B > x/E\tilde{A}^{(k)}) \\
&\sim E(B)P(\tilde{A}^{(k)} > x) + c(E\tilde{A}^{(k)})^{\alpha} P(A > x) \\
&\sim \left(E(B)d_k + cE(\tilde{A}^{(k)})^{\alpha}\right) P(A > x) \\
&= \left(E(B)d_k + c\mu^{k\alpha}\right) P(A > x) =: \psi_k P(A > x). \qquad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.4. *Under the conditions (22)-(24), we have*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X_t > x)}{P(A > x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X'_t > x)}{P(A > x)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k \ . \qquad (26)$$

Proof. We will follow the arguments of the proof of Theorem 2.2. In first step one can observe from (25) that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X_{t,m} > x)}{P(A > x)} = \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(X'_{t,m} > x)}{P(A > x)} = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \psi_k \ .$$

Step 2 is the same like i the proof of Theorem 2.2. Step 3 concerns the proof of equality:

$$\lim_{k_0\to\infty} \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(A > x)} = 0. \qquad (27)$$

Similarly, one will obtain an upper bound for the process (X'_t). Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > x)}{P(B > x)} \\
&\leq \frac{P(\sup_{k\geq k_0} B_{t-k} > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k)}{P(A > x)} + \frac{P(\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} C_{t,k}\mathbb{I}_{\{B_{t-k} < x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k\}} > x)}{P(A > x)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term on the right hand side is bounded above by:

$$\sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{P(B > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k)}{P(A > x)} \leq (c+1) \sum_{k=k_0}^{\infty} \frac{P(A > x(1-\varepsilon)/\mu^k)}{P(A > x)}.$$

Using the Potter's bounds we can conclude that this term goes to 0 as first x and then k_0 go to ∞. To prove that the second term on the right hand side goes to 0 as first x and then k_0 go to ∞ we can proceed in the same like in the proof of Theorem 2.2 using a fact that $\lim_{x\to\infty} xP(A^2 > x) = \infty$ for $1 < \alpha < 2$. □

3. Asymptotics for sums and maxima

Throughout this section we assume that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary process satisfying (1) with distributions of A and B satisfying assumptions (5)–(7) of Model I (with $\alpha \neq 1$) or (22)–(24) of Model II. In either case, by the results of Section 2, the distribution of each X_t is regularly varying with some index $\alpha > 0$.

Remark 3. The sequence (X_t) can be shown to satisfy the well known drift/majorization criterion for geometric ergodicity of Markov chains (cf. [34] or [29]). For $0 < \varepsilon < \min\{1, \alpha\}$ for instance, the function $V : \mathbb{N}_0 \to [1, \infty)$ given by $V(x) = 1 + x^\varepsilon$, satisfies drift condition (5) in [29], where for small set C one can take a set of the form $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}$ with integer M large enough. This further means that process (X_t) is strongly mixing with a geometric rate (see Theorem 2 in [29]).

We argue next that the stationary time series (X_t) is jointly regularly varying, i.e. all its finite dimensional distributions are regularly varying. Namely, for a random variable Y_0 with Pareto distribution $P(Y_0 > y) = y^{-\alpha}$ for $y \geq 1$ and a sequence $Y_n = Y_0\mu^n,\ n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the following holds.

Lemma 3.1. *Under assumptions of Model I or Model II as $x \to \infty$,*

$$\left((x^{-1}X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0} \,\middle|\, X_0 > x\right) \xrightarrow{fidi} (Y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}_0}. \tag{28}$$

Here we use "$\xrightarrow{\text{fidi}}$" to denote convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions. In the language of [11], (Y_t) represents the *tail sequence* of the sequence (X_t).

Proof. This follows immediately, since by regular variation of X_0 and the law of large numbers, as $x \to \infty$

$$\mathcal{L}(X_0/x \mid X_0 > x) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{L}(Y_0)$$
$$\mathcal{L}\left({X_0}^{-1} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(k)} \mid X_0 > x\right) \xrightarrow{d} \delta_{\mu^k}.$$

Hence, (28) follows by Slutsky argument noting that for $t \geq 0$:

$$X_t = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} C_{t,k} + \sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)}\,, \tag{29}$$

where $C_{t,k}$'s are defined in (3) and $\tilde{A}_i^{(t)}$'s in (12), with all the random variables on the right hand side being independent. □

Denote in the sequel by (a_n) a sequence of constants such that for any $u > 0$ as $n \to \infty$

$$nP(X_0 > a_n u) \to u^{-\alpha}. \tag{30}$$

It exists and tends to ∞ by the regular variation property of the random variables X_t. We observe next that the strong mixing property of the process (X_t) implies condition $\mathcal{A}'(a_n)$ of [10]. The condition states that for some sequence of integers $r_n \to \infty$, $r_n = \mathrm{o}(n)$, denoting $k_n = \lfloor n/r_n \rfloor$, as $n \to \infty$ we have

$$E\left[\exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{X_i}{a_n}\right)\right\}\right] - \prod_{k=1}^{k_n} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} f\left(\frac{kr_n}{n}, \frac{X_i}{a_n}\right)\right\}\right] \to 0. \tag{31}$$

for every $f \in C_K^+([0,1] \times \overline{\mathbb{R}} \setminus \{0\})$, where $C_K^+(E)$ is the space of all nonnegative continuous functions on E with compact support. Moreover, by the geometric decay of mixing coefficients (see Remark 3) such a sequence (r_n) can be taken to be of the order $o(n^\varepsilon)$, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$.

Finally, the structure of regularly varying process (X_t) in either of two regimes (Model I and II) allow us to apply Karamata's theorem and show that the process satisfies another well known condition in the literature. It is called anticlustering condition by [15] and [9], or finite mean cluster size condition in [10].

Lemma 3.2. *Under assumptions of Model I or Model II with $\alpha \neq 1$ we have*

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left(\max_{m \leq |t| \leq r_n} X_t > u a_n \,\middle|\, X_0 > u a_n\right) = 0. \tag{32}$$

Proof. By stationarity

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left(\max_{m \leq |t| \leq r_n} X_t > u a_n \,\middle|\, X_0 > u a_n\right) \leq \lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} 2 \sum_{t=m}^{r_n} P\left(X_t > u a_n \,\middle|\, X_0 > u a_n\right).$$

As we have seen in (29) for $t \geq 0$

$$X_t = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} C_{t,k} + \sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)}\,.$$

Since $C_{t,k}$, $t \geq 1, k \geq 0$, is independent of X_0, we note that:

$$P\left(\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} C_{t,k} > \frac{ua_n}{2} \,\middle|\, X_0 > ua_n\right) \leq P\left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} C_{t,k} > \frac{ua_n}{2}\right) = P(X_0 > ua_n/2)\,.$$

Therefore, since $r_n = o(n)$, it follows that:

(33)
$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{t=m}^{r_n} P\left(X_t > ua_n \,\middle|\, X_0 > ua_n\right) \leq \lim_{m\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{t=m}^{r_n} P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)} > \frac{ua_n}{2} \,\middle|\, X_0 > ua_n\right).$$

However, for $\alpha > 1$, by Markov inequality:

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)} > \frac{ua_n}{2} \,\middle|\, X_0 > ua_n\right) \leq 2\mu^t \frac{E(X_0 \mathbb{I}_{\{X_0 > ua_n\}})}{P(X_0 > ua_n) ua_n}.$$

Using Karamata's theorem, note that the right hand side converges to $2\mu^t(\alpha-1)^{-1}$ as $n\to\infty$. Therefore, (32) holds for $\alpha > 1$ and both Model I and II.

For Model I and $\alpha < 1$, we first observe that:

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)} > x\right) \leq P\left(X_0 > \frac{(1-\varepsilon)x}{\mu^t}\right) + \sum_{k \leq \frac{(1-\varepsilon)x}{\mu^t}} P(X_0 = k) P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)} > x\right).$$

By Markov inequality, the last sum above is bounded by

$$\mu^t \frac{E(X_0 \mathbb{I}_{\{X_0 \leq \frac{(1-\varepsilon)x}{\mu^t}\}})}{x}\,.$$

Clearly

$$P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)} > \frac{ua_n}{2} \,\middle|\, X_0 > ua_n\right) \leq \frac{P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{X_0} \tilde{A}_i^{(t)} > \frac{ua_n}{2}\right)}{P\left(X_0 > ua_n\right)}.$$

Hence, the summands on the right hand side of (33) can be bounded from above by

$$\frac{P\left(X_0 > \frac{(1-\varepsilon)ua_n}{2\mu^t}\right)}{P\left(X_0 > ua_n\right)} + \mu^t \frac{E(X_0 \mathbb{I}_{\{X_0 \leq \frac{(1-\varepsilon)ua_n}{2\mu^t}\}})}{P(X_0 > ua_n) ua_n/2}\,.$$

Now, if $\alpha < 1$, apply Potter's bound together with Karamata theorem to conclude that after summing these terms for $t = m, \ldots, r_n$, we may let first $n\to\infty$ and then $m\to\infty$ to obtain limit 0. If $\alpha = 1$, then we follow the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 2.2. We have

$$E(X_0 1_{\{X_0 \leq y\}}) \leq \int_0^y P(X_0 > u)du =: \tilde{L}(y),$$

where $\tilde{L}(y)$ is slowly varying. Hence, by Potter's bounds for each $\delta > 0$ there exists $C = C_\delta$ such that

$$\mu^t \frac{E(X_0 \mathbb{I}_{\{X_0 \le \frac{(1-\varepsilon)ua_n}{2\mu^t}\}})}{P(X_0 > ua_n)ua_n/2} = \mu^t \frac{\tilde{L}\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)ua_n}{2\mu^t}\right)}{P(X_0 > ua_n)ua_n/2}$$
$$\le C_\delta \mu^t \frac{\tilde{L}\left(ua_n\right)}{P(X_0 > ua_n)ua_n/2} \max\{(2\mu^t)^\delta (1-\varepsilon)^{-\delta}, (2\mu^t)^{-\delta}(1-\varepsilon)^\delta\}.$$

□

Remark 4. We note that the above argument does not work for $\alpha = 1$. Indeed, Theorem 1.5.9a in [12] implies that

$$\frac{\int_0^y u^{-1} L(u)du}{L(y)} \sim \frac{\int_0^y P(X_0 > u)du}{yP(X_0 > y)} \to \infty.$$

3.1. **Point process and maxima.** Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 allow us to describe the asymptotic behavior of the following point processes

$$N_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(i/n,\, X_i/a_n)} \qquad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{34}$$

We recall the basic notions of point processes theory, for a good introduction we refer to [40] or [41]. Let E be a locally compact Hausdorff topological space and let $M_p(E)$ be a space of Radon point measures on E. The space $M_p(E)$ is equipped with vague metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$. We say that a sequence $\mu_n \in M_p(E)$ converges vaguely to $\mu \in M_p(E)$ if $\int_E f d\mu_n \to \int_E f d\mu$ for all nonnegative continuous functions on E with compact support. Once the state $M_p(E)$ is endowed with a vague topology, one can study distributional limits of its random elements like N_n.

It turns out by Theorem 2.3 in [10] that there exist a point processes $N^{(u)}$, $u > 0$ on the space $[0,1] \times (u, \infty)$ with compound Poisson structure such that as $n \to \infty$

$$N_n\Big|_{[0,1]\times(u,\infty)} \xrightarrow{d} N^{(u)}. \tag{35}$$

By the same theorem in [10] *the extremal index* of the stationary sequence (X_t) (see [40] for instance) equals

$$\theta = P(\sup_{i \ge 1} Y_i \le 1) = P(Y_0 \le 1/\mu) = 1 - \mu^\alpha > 0. \tag{36}$$

Therefore, partial maxima of the process (X_t) converge to the scaled Fréchet distribution.

Corollary 3.3. *Under assumptions of Model I or Model II with $\alpha \neq 1$, as $n \to \infty$ it holds that*

$$P\left(\frac{M_n}{a_n} \leq x\right) \to \exp\left(-(1-\mu^\alpha)x^{-\alpha}\right),$$

for every $x \geq 0$, where $M_n = \max(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$.

However more precise statement on the behavior of large values can be made. For instance, the following proposition describes the clustering of large values in the sequence (X_t) and it follows from (35) by the similar token as corollary above (see e.g. [32]).

Proposition 3.4. *Under assumptions of Model I or Model II with $\alpha \neq 1$ there is a compound Poisson process N° on $[0,1]$ such that*

$$N_n^\circ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{\frac{i}{n}} \mathbb{I}_{\{X_i > a_n\}} \xrightarrow{d} N^\circ, \qquad n \to \infty. \tag{37}$$

The proof of the proposition follows directly from (35) by Theorem 4.2 of [30]. Moreover, the limiting process N° has the following representation

$$N^\circ \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \kappa_i \delta_{T_i},$$

where $\sum_i \delta_{T_i}$ is a homogeneous Poisson point process on the interval $[0,1]$ with intensity θ and $(\kappa_i)_{i\geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with values in $\mathbb{N}$ independent of it. Finally, random variables κ_i have geometric distribution since by Theorem 2.3 in [10]

$$P(\kappa_1 = k) = \frac{1}{\theta}\left[P\left(|\{j \geq 0 : Y_j > 1\}| = k\right) - P\left(|\{j \geq 0 : Y_j > 1\}| = k+1\right)\right] = \mu^{-\alpha(k-1)}(1-\mu^{-\alpha})$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

3.2. **Partial sums.** In the case $\alpha > 2$, which we do not consider here in detail (see Remark 2), one can show that the classical central limit theorem for strongly mixing sequences due to Ibragimov applies (see [29], Theorem 5). Namely, as $n \to \infty$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left(S_n - nEB/(1-\mu)\right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $\sigma^2 = E(X_0)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E(X_0 X_i) < \infty$ and S_n denote partial sums of the process, i.e. $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$, $n \geq 1$. In the case $0 < \alpha < 2$, X_t's have infinite variance and an alternative limit

theorem holds. That is, there exists an α–stable random variable $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ such that properly centered and normalized partial sums converge to $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$.

Under the assumptions of Model I, for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, using Theorem 3.1 in [15] together with lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 and the strong mixing property of the stationary sequence (X_t) (cf. Remark 3), one can deduce the following result

$$\frac{S_n}{a_n} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{S}_\alpha \,.$$

Similarly, when $\alpha \in (1,2)$ under assumptions of either Model I or II, strictly stationary sequence (X_t) satisfies

$$\frac{S_n - E\frac{X_i}{a_n}\mathbb{I}_{\{\frac{|X_i|}{a_n}\le 1\}}}{a_n} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{S}_\alpha \,,$$

however, an additional technical condition is needed, see Theorem 3.1 in [15] and condition (3.2) therein. In either case the limit $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ is an α–stable random variable with a Lévy triple $(0,\phi,r)$ identifiable as in [9]. Using results in [10] (cf. [33]) it seems that with an additional effort, one can also show a functional limit theorem for the partial sums under similar conditions, but we do not pursue that here.

References

[1] Alosh, M.A. and Alzaid, A.A. (1987). First order integer valued autoregressive (INAR(1)) process. *J. Time Ser. Anal.* **8**, 261–275.

[2] Altman, E. (2004). On stochastic recursive equations and infinite server queues. *Rapport de recherche 5211.*

[3] Altman, E. (2002). Stochastic recursive equations with applications to queues with dependent vacations. *Ann. Oper. Research* **112(1)**, 43–61.

[4] Altman, E. (2002). Stochastic recursive equations with applications to queues with dependent vacations. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **112(1)**, 43–61.

[5] Altman, E. (2005). On stochastic recursive equations and infinite server queues. In: *Proceedings of IEEE infocom*, 13–17.

[6] Athreya, K.B. and Jaggers, P. (1997). *Classical and modern branching processes.* IMA volumes in mathematics and its applications **84**, Springer, New York.

[7] Athreya, K.B. and Vidyashankar, A.N (2001). *Branching processes. Handbook of statistics 19: stochastic processes: theory and methods.* Elsevier, Amsterdam.

[8] Athreya, K.B. and Ney, P.E. (1972). *Branching Processes.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[9] Bartkiewicz, K., Jakubowski, A., Mikosch, T. and Wintenberger, O. (2011). Stable limits for sums of dependent infinite variance random variables. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **150(3-4)**, 337–372.

[10] Basrak, B., Krizmanić, D. and Segers, J. (2011). A functional limit theorem for dependent sequences with infinite variance stable limits. *To appear in Ann.Probab.*.

[11] Basrak, B. and Segers, J. (2009). Regularly varying multivariate time series. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **119**, 1055–1080.

[12] Bingham, N. H., Goldie, C. M. and Teugels, J. L. (1989). *Regular variation*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 27. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[13] Cardinal, M., Roy, R. and Lambert, J. (1999). On the application of integervalued time series models for the analysis of disease incidence. *Stat. Medicine* **18**, 2025–2039.

[14] Davis, R. and Resnick, S. I. (1988). Extremes of moving averages of random variables from the domain of attraction of the double exponential distribution. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **30**, 41–68.

[15] Davis, R. A. and Hsing, T. (1995). Point process and partial sum convergence for weakly dependent random variables with infinite variance. *Ann. Probab.* **23**, 879–917.

[16] Denisov, D., Foss, S. and Korshunov, D. (2010). Asymptotic of randomly stopped sums in the presence of heavy tails. *Bernoulli* **16(4)**, 971–994.

[17] Dion, J.P., Gauthier, G. and Latour, A. (1995). Branching processes with immigration and integervalued time series. *Serdica Math. J.* **21**, 123–136.

[18] Eliazar, I. (2008). On the $G/GI/\infty$ discrete-time queue. *Probab. Eng. Inf. Sci.* **22**, 557–585.

[19] Fay, G., Gonzlez-Arvalo, B., Mikosch, T. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2006). Modeling teletraffic arrivals by a Poisson cluster process. *Queueing Syst.* **51**, 121-170.

[20] Fiems, D. and Altman, E. (2002). Markov-Modulated Stochastic Recursive Equations with Applications to Delay-Tolerant Networks. *Rapport de recherche 6872*.

[21] Foster, J.H. and Williamson, J.A. (1971). Limit theorems for the Galton-Watson process with time-dependent immigration. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **20(3)**, 227–235.

[22] Le Gall, J.F. (2000). *Random trees and spatial branching processes*. Maphysto Lecture Notes, University of Aarhus.

[23] Galton, F. and Watson, H.W. (1874). On the probability of the extinction of the families. *J. R. Anthropol. Soc. Lond.* **4**, 138–144.

[24] Grishenchkin, S.A. (1992). On a relation between processor sharing queues and Crump-Mode-Jager branching processes. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **24**, 653178

[25] Grishenchkin, S.A. (1992). Multiclass batch arrival retrial queueus analyzed as branching processes with immigration. *Queueing Syst.* **11**, 395–418.

[26] Hall, P. and Heyde, C. C. (1980). *Martingale limit theory and its application*. Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Academic Press, Inc., New York-London.

[27] Heathcote, C.R. (1965). A Branching Process Allowing Immigration. *J. Royal Stat. Soc.. Ser. B* **27(1)**, 138–143.

[28] Hult, H. and Samorodnitsky, G. (2008). Tail probabilities for infinite series of regularly varying random vectors. *Bernoulli* **14**, 838–874.

[29] Jones, G. L. (2004). On the Markov chain central limit theorem. *Probab. Surveys* **1**, 299–320.

[30] Kallenberg, O. (1983). *Random Measures, 3rd Edition*. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.

[31] Kolmogorov, A.N. (1938). On the solution of a biological problem. In: *Porc. of Tomsk University, vol 2. Tomsk University*, 7–12.

[32] Leadbetter, M. R. and Rootzen, H. (1988). Extremal theory for stochastic processes. *Annals of Probability* **16**, 431–478.

[33] Louhichi, S. and Rio, E. (2011). Functional convergence to stable Lvy motions for iterated random Lipschitz mappings. *Electron. J. Proab.* **16**, 2452–2480.

[34] Meyn, S.P. and Tweedie, R.L. (1993). *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

[35] Nagaev, S. V. (1979). Large deviations of sums of independent random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **5**, 745–789.

[36] Pakes (1971). Branching Processes with Immigration. *J. Appl. Probab.* **8(1)**, 32–42.

[37] Peligrad, M. (1999). Convergence of stopped sums of weakly dependent random variables. *Electron. J. Probab.* **4**, 1–13.

[38] Quine, M.P. (1970). The multi-type Galton-Watson process with immigration. *J. Appl Probab.* **7**, 411–422.

[39] Resing, J.C. (1993). Polling systems and multi-type branching processes. *Queueing Syst.* **13**, 409–426.

[40] Resnick, S. I. (1987). *Extreme values, regular variation, and point processes*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

[41] Resnick, S. I. (2007). *Heavy-Tail Phenomena: Probabilistic nad Statistical Modeling.* Springer Science+Business Media LLC, New York.

[42] Robert, C.Y. and Segers, J. (2008). Tails of random sums of a heavy-tailed number of light-tailed terms. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **43**, 85–92.

[43] Seneta (1970). On invariant measures for simple branching processes. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **2**, 359–362.

[44] Sevastyanov, B.A. (1957). Limit theorem for branching processes of special form. *Theor. Probab. Appl.* **2**, 121–176.

[45] Vatutin, V.A. and Dyakonova, E.E. Multitype branching processes and some queueing systems. *J.of Mathematical Sciences* **111**, 3901–3909.

[46] Venkataraman, K.N. and Nanthi, K. (1982). A limit theorem on subcritical GaltonWatson process with immigration. *Ann. Probab.* **10**, 1069–1074.

[47] Yashkov, S.F. and Yashkova, A.S. (2007). Processor sharing: a survey of the mathematical theory. *Autom. Remote Control* **68(9)**, 1662–1731.

Department of Mathematics, University of Zagreb, Bijenička 30, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia.

E-mail address: bbasrak@math.hr

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Ottawa, K1N 6N5 Ottawa, Canada.

E-mail address: rkulik@uottawa.ca

Mathematical Institute, University of Wrocław, Poland.

E-mail address: zbigniew.palmowski@gmail.com